

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 6-11 and 16-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-3 and 6-11 are hereby amended to eliminate means-plus-function treatment and to correct various minor errors. Claims 23-29 are new but are of generally the same scope as Claims 1-11.

Applicant wishes to thank Examiner Ochylski for the courtesies extended in the telephonic interview on August 11, 2010 in which the amended claims set forth above were discussed and a general agreement reached as to their patentability over the current prior art of record, subject to further searching and examination.

The claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Joseph* in view of *Schott*. As discussed during the interview, neither *Joseph* nor *Schott* disclose the ability to change the size of the sizing cage during extruding operation. Both references do disclose sensors on the sizing cage, but these only regulate airflow in the tube.

As recited in Claims 1 and 23, the cage sizing subsystem uses sensors to change the cage size during extruding operation, which neither *Joseph* nor *Schott* are capable of doing. Specifically, as recited in claims 1 and 23, the position or diameter of the cage is controlled responsive to a real time measurement by the sensors of the diameter of the tube and/or distance between the cage and the extruded tube. This feature is not shown by the prior art of record.

The newly cited reference to *Halter* does alter the size (and height) of the “calibration basket 3,” but does so not in response to sensors that measure the diameter and distance to the cage of the extruded tube, but instead based on a flattened width sensor 24 downstream of the pinch rollers. *Halter*, Col. 5: ll. 30-35; ll 67-69 and Col. 6, ll. 1-15. It appears that the foil width measurement device is a contact sensor, as well. Accordingly, Applicant submits that *Halter* does not, either alone or in combination with the other prior art of record, render the claimed invention unpatentable.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits the required fee for an additional 7 claims in excess of the total of 20 claims. In the event any other fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any required fees due (other than issue fees), and to credit any overpayment made, in connection with the filing of this paper to Deposit Account 50-2180 of Storm LLP.

Should Examiner require any further clarification to place this Application in condition for allowance, Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: September 13, 2010

/Mark D. Perdue/

Mark D. Perdue

Reg. No. 36,890

Storm LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 7100
Dallas, Texas 75202
Telephone: (214) 347-4708
Fax: (214) 347-4799